SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

# **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil decket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

the civil docket sheet. (SEE II	NSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF T	HE FORM.)				
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS			
DENNIS ELLIS			NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.			
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff		County of Residence o	of First Listed Defendant		
(c) Attorney's (Firm Na	me, Address, Telephone Number and	d Email Address	s) NOTE: IN LAND	O CONDEMNATION CASES, US	SE THE LOCATION OF THE	
Craig Thor Kimmel, E Kimmel & Silverman, 30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002 (215) 540-8888 II. BASIS OF JURISE	P.C.	Only)	LAND I Attorneys (If Known)	NVOLVED.	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
		3,	(For Diversity Cases Only)		and One Box for Defendant)	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff			Citizen of This State			
<ul><li>2 U.S. Government Defendant</li></ul>	<ul> <li>4 Diversity</li> <li>(Indicate Citizenship of Parties)</li> </ul>	in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2		
		Ź	Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3	0606	
IV. NATURE OF SUI	Γ (Place an "X" in One Box Only)  TORTS			International of the control of the		
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY  □ 310 Airplane □ 362 Pe □ 315 Airplane Product         Liability □ 365 Pe □ 320 Assault, Libel & □ 368 As □ 330 Federal Employers'         Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product         Liability □ 371 Tr □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal         Injury □ 360 Other Personal         Injury □ 441 Voting □ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing/         Accommodations □ 444 Welfare □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - □ 550 Ci	nuth in Lending ther Personal operty Damage operty Damage oduct Liability  ER PETITIONS  otions to Vacate intence s Corpus:	GORFEITURE/PENALTY    610 Agriculture   620 Other Food & Drug   625 Drug Related Seizure   of Property 21 USC 881   630 Liquor Laws   640 R.R. & Truck   650 Airline Regs.   660 Occupational   Safety/Health   690 Other   LABOR   710 Fair Labor Standards   Act   720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations   730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting   & Disclosure Act   740 Railway Labor Act   790 Other Labor Litigation   791 Empl. Ret. Inc.   Security Act   IMMIGRATION   462 Naturalization Application   463 Habeas Corpus -   Alien Detannee   465 Other Immigration   Actions	BANKRUPTCY  □ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157  PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark  SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g))  FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	OTHER STATUTES  □ 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations  ■ 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 810 Selective Service □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 □ 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts □ 892 Economic Stabilization Act □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 894 Energy Allocation Act □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
□ 2 Re	n "X" in One Box Only) moved from	from	Reinstated or 5 Transft Reopened 5 another (specif	erred from	Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	ON Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under 15 U.S. C. SECTION 16 Brief description of cause: Fair Debt Collection Pra				Jadgment	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLA UNDER F.R.C.P. 23		DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:	
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER		
Explanation:						
DATE 17-15-11	SIGN	NATURE OF AT	ITORNEY OF RECORD	<u> </u>		

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
Case 2:11-cv-07661-RB Document 1 Filed 12/15/11 Page 2 of 9

assignment to appropriate calendar.  Address of Plaintiff. 40.75 Law Street Mulberry	· •
Address of Plaintiff: 4075 Lane Street, Mulberry, Address of Defendant: 507 Productial Road, Horsham	, DA 19044
Address of Defendant: 20 1 1100011711 1000 11008 ham	+ PA 1909 (
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:  (Use Reverse Side Fo	Additional Company
	• ,
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporatio	
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1	(a)) $Yes \square No \square$
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□ No□
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	
Case Number:Judge	Date Terminated:
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one	year previously terminated action in this court?
	Yes No 🗹
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prio action in this court?	r suit pending or within one year previously terminated
	Yes No
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier	r numbered case pending or within one year previously
terminated action in this court?	Yes No 1
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rig	hts case filed by the same individual?
	Yes No No
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)	
<ul> <li>A. Federal Question Cases:</li> <li>1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts</li> </ul>	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:
2.   FELA	1. ☐ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	2. ☐ Airplane Personal Injury
4. □ Antitrust	3.   Assault, Defamation
5. Patent	4. ☐ Marine Personal Injury
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	5.  Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
0. D Labor-Management Relations	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please
7. □ Civil Rights	specify)
8.   Habeas Corpus	7. Products Liability
9.   Securities Act(s) Cases	8. Products Liability — Asbestos
10.  Søcial Security Review Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases
11. All other Federal Question Cases 150.5.6. \$ 1697 (Please specify)	(Please specify)
ARBITRATION CERT	TFICATION
(Check Appropriate Co	ategory)
pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and	ty: belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	, Beautiful and sind over decided case exceed the sum of
□ Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	
DATE: 12-15-1\	57100
Attorney-at-Law  NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if the	Attorney I.D.# re has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38
certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or	
except as noted above.	Francisco serminated action in this court
DATE: 12-15-11	57166
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#

# Case 2:11-cv-07661-RB Document 1 Filed 12/15/11 Page 3 of 9

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

# **CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM**

Dennis	Ellis	: :	CIVIL ACTION		
	v.	: :			
NCO Financi	v. al Systems, Inc	: · :	NO.		
plaintiff shall comp filing the complaint side of this form.) designation, that de the plaintiff and all	plete a Case Management t and serve a copy on all de In the event that a defe efendant shall, with its firs	Track Designation Fafendants. (See § 1:0 ndant does not agree appearance, subminagement Track Des	tion Plan of this court, couns form in all civil cases at the ti 3 of the plan set forth on the re- be with the plaintiff regarding it to the clerk of court and ser ignation Form specifying the	me of everse g said ve on	
SELECT ONE OF	THE FOLLOWING CA	ASE MANAGEME	NT TRACKS:		
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.					
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. ( )					
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.					
(d) Asbestos – Caso exposure to asb	es involving claims for pe estos.	rsonal injury or prop	perty damage from	( )	
commonly refer	ement – Cases that do not rred to as complex and that reverse side of this form	at need special or int	ense management by		
the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.)					
(f) Standard Manag	gement – Cases that do no	t fall into any one of	f the other tracks.	( )	
12-15-11	Craig Thor Attorney-a	Kimmel	Dennis Ellis Attorney for	,	
Date			Attorney for	•	
715-540-88	88 877-788-	2864	Kimmel@credit	<u>aw.</u> Com	
Telephone	FAX Num	ber	E-Mail Address		

(Civ. 660) 10/02

# 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE 2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA 3 DENNIS ELLIS, 4 Plaintiff 5 V. Case No.: 6 7 NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC., COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR **JURY TRIAL** 8 Defendant (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices) 9 10 **COMPLAINT** 11 DENNIS ELLIS ("Plaintiff"), by and through his attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, 12 P.C., alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. ("Defendant"): 13 INTRODUCTION 14 1. Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA"). 16 JURISDICTION AND VENUE 17 2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states 18 that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court 19 20 without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original 21 jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States. 22 3. Defendant has its corporate headquarters in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania 23 and as such, personal jurisdiction is established. 24 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1). 25

#### **PARTIES**

- 5. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Mulberry, Florida 33860.
- 6. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(3).
- 7. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road, Horsham, PA 19044.
- 8. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 9. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 10. At all pertinent times hereto, Defendant was hired to collect a consumer debt and attempted to collect that debt from Plaintiff.
- 11. The debt arose out of transactions that were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 12. Beginning on or about October 1, 2011, and continuing through November 2011, Defendant constantly and continuously placed collection calls to Plaintiff on his work phone seeking and demanding payment for an alleged debt.
- 13. Defendant contacted Plaintiff, on average, three (3) times a day, sometimes calling as frequently as five (5) times a day.
  - 14. At times, Defendant even contacted Plaintiff on his work telephone on Saturdays.
- 15. Also, Defendant has left messages on Plaintiff's work voicemail in its attempts to collect a debt.
  - 16. In those instances where Plaintiff would answer the phone, Defendant would

hang up on him.

- 17. Upon information and belief, Defendant intended to harass Plaintiff by calling him and hanging up on him when he would answer, believing that to do so, would cause Plaintiff to pay the alleged debt.
- 18. On more than one occasion, Plaintiff instructed Defendant to stop calling him at his place of employment.
- 19. However, Defendant disregarded Plaintiff's instructions, and continued to contact him at his place of employment.
- 20. Most recently, Defendant contacted Plaintiff on November 17, 2011, at 1:10 p.m. and 7:24 p.m.; November 21, 2011, at 7:33 p.m.; and November 23, 2011, at 12:40 p.m.
- 21. Defendant was attempting to collect on a hospital bill from 2007, which Plaintiff had previously paid in full.
- 22. Upon information and belief, Defendant called Plaintiff on a repetitive basis with the intent to harass Plaintiff.
- 23. The repetitive calls to Plaintiff were intended by Defendant to be disturbing, harassing, and an invasion of privacy, so that Plaintiff would pay the alleged debt.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

24. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. <u>Taylor v. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay & Durand</u>, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." <u>Russell v. Equifax A.R.S.</u>, 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); <u>see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp.</u>, 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); <u>Clomon v. Jackson</u>, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).

13

15

17

18

19

21

23

24

25

25. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in
favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The
remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit
& Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the
Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be
construed liberally in favor of the consumer." <u>Johnson v. Riddle</u> , 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir.
2002).

26. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3rd Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public - that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous. and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

# **COUNT I** DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 27. In its actions to collect a debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:
  - a. Defendant violated the FDCPA generally;

- b. Defendant violated §1692c(a)(1) of the FDCPA by contacting Plaintiff at an unusual time or place known or which should be known to be inconvenient to Plaintiff to receive collection calls from Defendant, specifically calling Plaintiff at his place of employment on Saturdays;
- c. Defendant violated §1692c(a)(3) of the FDCPA by contacting Plaintiff at his place of employment where the debt collector knows or has reason to know that Plaintiff's employer prohibits Plaintiff from receiving such communication;
- d. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA when it harassed, oppressed or abused Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt;
- e. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA when it caused Plaintiff's phone to ring, and engaged Plaintiff in conversation repeatedly or continuously with the intent to annoy, abuse, or harass Plaintiff;
- f. Defendant violated §1692e of the FDCPA by using false, deceptive and misleading representations in connection with the collection of a debt;
- g. Defendant violated §1692e(2) of the FDCPA by falsely representing the character, amount, or legal status of any debt;
- h. Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA when it used unfair and unconscionable means in connection with the collection of a debt; and
- i. Defendant violated §1692f(1) of the FDCPA by collection an amount not authorized by the agreement creating the debt.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, DENNIS ELLIS, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

a. All actual damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(1);

## Case 2:11-cv-07661-RB Document 1 Filed 12/15/11 Page 9 of 9

25

- b. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1693k(a)(3); and
- d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

# **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, DENNIS ELLIS, demands a jury trial in this

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

By:

Craig Thor Kimmel Attorney ID No. 57100

Tara L. Patterson

Attorney ID No. 88343

Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.

30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002

Phone: (215) 540-8888

Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email:

<u>kimmel@creditlaw.com</u>

Email:

tpatterson@creditlaw.com